DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 192 JC 740 184

AUTHOR Lombardi, John
TITLE The Next Ten Years.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 74
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at Spring Seminar Program of the Association of Community College Trustees (Anaheim, California, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Collective Bargaining; *College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Change; *Educational Planning; Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; Speeches

ABSTRACT

Major changes that have contributed to the evolution of today's community college from the junior college of the 1930's and 1940's are outlined, and the probable direction such colleges will follow during the next 5 to 10 years is pointed out. The discussions center around the colleges and the students, functions, student services, teaching/learning revolution, enlarging the campus limits, teaching assistants, expansion of administration, multiplication of State boards, finances, new priorities, tuition, collective bargaining, and reaffirmation of the goal of universal higher education. Conclusions are summarized. (DB)

ED 092192

University of California, Los Angeles 90024

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

96 Powell Library Building

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE NEXT TEN YEARS

by

John Lombardi

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

Spring Seminar Program

Association of Community College Trustees

Anaheim, California

April 18, 1974

JC 740 184

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Association of Community College Trustees for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Association of Community College Trustees or the National Institute of Education.

In formulating issues or enumerating problems we in effect concentrate on our difficulties rather than on our accomplishments. This is natural; we attend conferences such as this to find out what is in store for us this year, next year and beyond. And each prediction becomes a subject that requires our attention. We hope as a result of attendance at a conference such as this to make the adjustments in our goals, functions, teaching-learning process, delivery systems, governing pattern, student services, and trustees's role. In your program you have listed seven or eight major issues on which you hope to get answers.

In my talk tonight I will outline the major changes that have contributed to the evolution of today's community college from the junior college of the 1930's and 1940's. In addition I will touch on most of the issues that are listed in the 1974 Spring Seminar Program. Along the way I will point out the probable direction the college will follow during the next five to ten years. I wish I could promise you a formula to help you reach your destination with a minimum of detours. As you know each of the issues is complex; most evoke varying responses. Moreover, events have a way of mocking our predictions.

The characteristic that distinguishes the colleges of the 1970's from those of the 1940's is size in all of its dimensions. One would be hard pressed to find one characteristic of the 1970's that had not grown at a phenomenal rate.

The Colleges and the Students

Today's colleges are larger as well as more numerous. The students represent a broader cross section of the population. With the exception of the elementary and high school age group a community college campus may include everyone from nursery school children to senior citizens.

Student enrollment is still increasing but not as rapidly as in the 1950's and 1960's. In fact there is evidence that were it not for the part-time and older students enrollment would be much lower than it is. Some colleges have experienced a decline.

Functions

Functions have multiplied from the relatively simple offerings of transfer, occupational and general education programs to programs for preschool children, adult basic education for the illiterates and near-illiterates, remedial education for the disadvantaged high school graduates and dropouts, and recreational, cultural, and intellectual activities for the senior citizens and the general population. Some of us undertake to help the community solve its economic, political, social, and environmental problems.

Student Services

Expansion has been particularly characteristic of our student services. These include counseling, placement, financial aid--scholarships, grants, loans, work-study--medical clinics, special aid to veterans and their children, informational services on housing, drug addiction, V.D., contraceptives and childcare centers for students' children. Some colleges also offer books, supplies, breakfast, lunch, carfare and other aid to needy students. At the rate we are increasing student services we will become a special adjunct to the social security system.

Teaching-Learning Revolution

Teaching and learning have become more diversified. This is exemplified in the transformation of the library to a learning resources center. Recordings, television tapes, broadcasts, cassettes, films, and computers are now as common as books in the learning process. More

emphasis is placed on the student in the learning process. If he wishes, a student can learn at his own pace with no or limited guidance from an instructor.

Many educators are predicting a revolutionary change in the teaching-learning process. Experimentation with a variety of new teaching-learning techniques has been going on for more than ten years. In the experiments the objectives are twofold: to improve the learning of students and to reduce the costs of the learning process. The first used to be a paramount; during the last five years the second has become equally, if not more, important.

Basic to, and an integral part of most of the plans is the change in the role of instructor from one of continuous contact with students to one of manager of a team of paraprofessionals and creator or gatherer of learning materials in small units that students may use at their convenience. They are free to come and go as they please provided they complete the units of work for the course. Programmed self-instruction is no longer exceptional in colleges.

Interest in the new technology of teaching is so widespread that directories or inventories of instructional programs and materials are being produced in various parts of the country. These directories list nearly every subject area alphabetically, including technical-vocational, general education, and liberal arts programs and units. Some programs cover entire courses, others particular segments of courses (Sheldon and Park, 1972). At the same time, workshops on instructional systems, media, management, and evaluation are becoming common. A 1972 Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Report calls this development "The Fourth Revolution," succeeding the piece of chalk and the blackboard, lantern-

slide projector, and tape recorder in the language laboratory.

Enlarging the Campus Limits

The place of learning is also changing. On a larger scale than ever before learning is moving from the campus to the home, the storefront, the prison, the union hall, the church, the office. Educational television, the telephone network, satellite campuses, college-without-walls are part of the educational revolution of this decade.

So far all of these new delivery systems form only a small part of our educational complex conducted on fixed campuses in permanent structures. Yet several large systems now in operation prove that a permanent campus is not an absolute. Since 1956 TV College in Chicago has enrolled 200,000 students and awarded 350 AA degrees. Whatcum Community College in the state of Washington and Vermont Community College have no permanent campuses although they maintain the traditional teacher-student-classroom relationship in temporary quarters throughout their respective areas. Even less dependent on the campus or the satellite is the college-without-walls. In New York State two systems make it possible for students to earn degrees on the basis of what they know regardless of how they acquire their knowledge.

Teaching Assistants

This curriculum and teaching revolution has introduced a large number of new personnel directly or indirectly involved with the learning process. To staff the learning resources and computer learning centers, the autotutorial laboratory, the television studio, and other non-traditional learning areas we have added tutors, readers, technicians plus some high level directors and coordinators. In most colleges these new paraprofessionals have been limited to helping the classroom instructor;

in a very few colleges they have replaced classroom instructors. Rather than reduce costs by increasing faculty productivity, paraprofessionals increase costs. Some claim that the extra costs are justified since the paraprofessionals have been an important factor in the improvement of student learning.

Expansion of Administration

Our administrative structure has become exceedingly complex. The simple pattern of president, dean of men, dean of women, registrar--seems quaint in comparison to the complex organizations of chancellor, presidents, vice presidents, deans, associate and assistant deans, plus coordinators, directors, special assistants, even lobbyists at the state and national capitals. It seems unnecessary to point out that administrative costs have increased.

Multiplication of State Boards

At the same time that expansion has been taking place on the campus and in the district office, the state boards have multiplied. In many states the local colleges are subject to at least two boards--one for the community colleges and another for all postsecondary institutions. Some critics maintain that local control is a fiction; that the various state boards through policies and guidelines make most of the important decisions affecting our colleges (Wattenbarger, 1973).

With special revenue sharing colleges will find themselves working with mayors, councils and boards of supervisors. For example, the 1974 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act decentralizes manpower training programs but gives responsibility to state and local governments not to educational agencies. We can expect these local non-educational agencies to impose some new regulations on the distribution and expenditure of

these funds.

Since our colleges have become conglomerates in size, diversity of programs and multiplication of personnel, I was not surprised that under "Trustee Frustrations" you listed "Lack of Time".

Finances

For a short period in 1972 and 1973 it seemed as if the financial problems of the late 1960's were over or about to disappear. State aid increased substantially making it possible to reduce property taxes. Fewer colleges faced deficit financing. But this happy state did not last long. The Arab-Israeli War of October 1973 and the ensuing energy crisis have created a new financial crisis. If the sag in the economy and the rise in unemployment cause sales, income and other tax revenues to decline while the unprecedented inflationary trend increases the cost of instruction and support services our colleges may experience another financial crisis. Salary increases which averaged about five percent during the past few years will more likely be seven to ten percent during the next few years.

New Priorities

Also serious for the financial well-being of our colleges is the change in our national and state priorities on our financial resources. The energy crisis and its effects on the economy are the immediate reasons for this change, but the change is more deep seated.

In February of 1974 we learned from President Nixon's State of the Union message that today's national priorities are unemployment insurance, medical insurance, mass transportation, new energy sources, clean environment, national defense. Education was mentioned but it was almost an afterthought. In contrast to the billions the President proposed for

the new priorities, education received very little in new money except for student aid, veterans' grants and loans (Office of Governmental Affairs, 1974). Education may get a little more from Congress but it is unlikely that Congress will change the order of priorities, especially the emphasis on student aid in its various forms. In general it is safe to predict the public will offer more support to the new priorities than to education. An exception is career education which is related to the national priority to reduce unemployment.

State priorities will not be too different from national priorities although education may fare better at the state capital than at the national capital. However, if state revenues fall as a result of a recession the generous appropriations of 1973 will not be repeated. Money will not be available unless new tax sources are found or legislators raise the present taxes.

Tuition: An Increasing Source of Revenue

With the pressure to eliminate the property tax as a source of revenue, with poor prospects for a large increase in state aid and with the reduction in federal grants, colleges will turn to students for more revenue. One of the more certain predictions I can make is that tuition and fees will become universal, and will increase gradually until by 1980 some colleges will be imposing tuition and fee charges approaching $700. Some are now charging $600. Resolutions of professional associations, union leaders and educators will have very little effect in the face of increasing costs and static or decreasing appropriations. My prediction is based on the following observations:

1. A study of tuition and fee patterns in community colleges shows that once a college starts charging tuition and fees it rarely

stops doing so; it hardly ever reduces them. Even some educators and trustees who favor a no-tuition policy find reasons for approving health and parking fees, nuisance fees for changes of program, laboratory fees, student body fees, fees for defraying capital and maintenance costs of student centers, cafeterias and book stores (Lombardi, 1973).

2. Private colleges are bringing pressure on legislatures to increase tuition at public colleges in order to make them more competitive.
3. Many people believe that those who benefit from education should pay for it. They claim it is unfair to force taxpayers to subsidize future doctors, lawyers and other highly paid professionals, most of whom come from families in the higher income group in our population.
4. Some people believe that student aid, work study and loans are available for those students who cannot afford to pay the tuition and fees.
5. Although not much has been said about them lately there are a dozen proposed state plans for implementing a cost of instruction tuition plan. In all of them the cost of instruction is graduated according to the student's income. So far no plan provides enough money to take care of the needs of poor students (Nathan, 1972).

I do not know how much influence you may have on this issue of no- or low-tuition. But if you adopt a position it should be realistic. You should know what is happening in your colleges. Trustees of the Chicago, Hawaii, California, Arizona, New York City and other colleges that claim

to have a no-tuition policy should examine the required and voluntary fees being charged to determine the extent to which the no-tuition policy is being observed in their colleges.

Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining crowds financing as a principal educational concern. Over 200 colleges are covered by collective bargaining agreements and the prospects are for more colleges to be involved, especially in Florida, Oregon and California. Collective bargaining has many implications for trustees as well as for administrators and faculty. Here I will touch on a few that affect trustees and administrators.

An issue of great concern is the scope of items that may be negotiated. Trustees and administrators strive to restrict the topics for negotiation; the employees insist that no topic should be excluded. Employers prefer a listing of negotiable items; employees act on the assumption that everything and anything is open for negotiation. In general, the employees' position seems to be prevailing over the employers'.

A perusal of the contracts reveals that almost everything related to the operation of the college is subject to negotiation. Educational policy and institutional administrative direction are negotiated as well as bread and butter issues such as wages, working conditions, fringe benefits, job security and seniority rights. It is not unusual for a contract to have a table of contents and/or an index of 75 or more items. Where a state law acts as a bar to the negotiation of a certain issue the contract may include a provision that the parties will work toward getting the law amended and/or if the law is amended that the issue may be renegotiated.

Collective bargaining is leading to a profound change in the

relationships among the board, the chancellor, the president, deans and other administrators. The assumption that these officers have a common interest because they are administrators cannot be taken for granted. Collective bargaining exposes the inherent conflicts among the various groups.

In the negotiating process only a few administrators participate directly. Some colleges may have pre-negotiation strategy meetings that enable administrators to express their views on possible issues that will arise; they may even prepare a rank-order priority listing of items on which the administrators have a stake. This is a viable procedure in single campus districts but in multicampus districts it is at best cumbersome. But in neither case can the input of administrators not on the employer negotiating team be decisive at the bargaining table. Such administrators act sometimes through representatives selected as resource persons to the negotiators. In general, administrator influence on negotiations varies inversely to the number of campuses involved. When as in Minnesota, a state agency negotiates the contract, the input from the campus administrators becomes miniscule with only two presidents representing the campus administrators.

Yet, directly or indirectly contracts affect not only the responsibilities of administrators but their prequisites--salaries, fringe benefits, tenure and right to teach during the evening. Obviously, the direct implementation of many of the contractual provisions falls primarily upon the dean of instruction and the chairpersons. They must live with the agreement for the duration of the contract which may extend up to three years. Under extreme circumstances administrators could ask the employer negotiators to reopen negotiations on a specific section but

this option, where it exists, is not frequently used. By and large, the administrators are left in limbo (Salmon, 1972). As a result of this cleavage between the various administrative echelons, collective bargaining with the second-and-lower echelon administrators has already begun in a number of college districts in New York and Michigan (Macomb County Community College, 1973; McHugh and O'Sullivan, 1971). Such collective bargaining need not destroy the management function but it will not strengthen it. The possibility exists for cooperation between the faculty and the administrative employee groups. Although seemingly far-fetched, the administrators might even refuse to cross a picket line during a faculty strike.

All of this points up the urgency for action in this area of college governance. Trustees and chief administrators must address themselves to the task of creating a management concept of administration.

Trustees need to examine the role of the president or chancellor. Most of us assume that he wants to act as the board agent. However, a Michigan study revealed that less than fifty percent of "the presidents preferred their role to be that of 'Board Agent' while forty percent expressed preference for the 'Consultant Role'" (Murton, 1974). The Consultant Role may have merit but in the hard negotiating process the Board must have an agent who can select and develop a negotiating team with the skill of the employee negotiators. When it comes to wages, hours and working conditions faculty cannot be considered as colleagues (Campbell, 1974); they act as trade unionists who will exact the most favorable terms possible from the employers.

Is collective bargaining inevitable? The answer is "No". Collective bargaining is far from universal in any enterprise. Some faculties

are so satisfied with their working conditions that they will resist it, other are ideologically opposed to the adversary labor-management concept, others are in colleges with such a high faculty turnover that unionization is impractical as well as unproductive for a union; others are in states or colleges where organization for collective bargaining is prohibited, discouraged or repressed.

It would be unrealistic for a board of trustees and a chief administrator to exclude from their planning the probability of collective bargaining. They must observe that "since the initiative to invoke collective bargaining lies with faculty, it is questionable whether it lies within the capacity of administration to inhibit the pace" (Education Commission of the States, 1972). Pertinent also is the possibility of judicial action such as the Florida Supreme Court ruling that public employees have an absolute right to collective bargaining under the state constitution (Semas, 1973) or federal legislation.

In individual colleges, trustees and chief administrators who consider collective bargaining incompatible with the purposes and operation of a college may still have the option, in conjunction with faculty and other employees to eschew collective bargaining. How successful they will be is a moot question. In collective bargaining states the time for this effort has passed; once collective bargaining is adopted it is rarely given up.

Summary

In this analysis of our present situation and the outlook for the next decade I have stressed the following:

1. Our colleges have become complex institutions offering a wide range of educational and non-educational services to nearly

every age group delivered in a variety of traditional and non-traditional ways.

2. Student enrollment in the traditional college-age group will decline but this will be partially offset by the enrollment of older students.

3. Funds for the colleges will come primarily from the state, students, and the federal government in that order. The property tax will provide a smaller proportion of the funds. The prospects for large increases in appropriations do not look good.

4. Education seems to be losing to other national and state activities for top priority on financial resources. Student financial aid and career education have highest priority among educational activities.

5. The ingredients of an educational revolution are present. They include the new technologies, responsibility on the student and the development of non-traditional learning delivery systems that place more responsibility for learning on the student than on the instructor. A parallel development are the experiments that attempt to substitute temporary learning places for the fixed permanent campuses.

6. State controls will increase with the multiplication of state community college boards and coordinating councils for higher education.

7. Collective bargaining will spread. By 1980 it may cover half or more of the faculty. Collective bargaining with administrators is also likely.

8. Collective bargaining changes governing patterns, makes educational change more difficult and increases the cost of instruction because of higher salaries and lower workloads.

Reaffirmation of the Goal of Universal Higher Education

I conclude my presentation with a plea for the reaffirmation of the goal of universal higher education. In our preoccupation with our daily problems let us not overlook the very special mission assigned to us--to extend universal education through the sophomore year.

We must fulfill the expectations of society for an educated citizenry and the desire of students to prepare themselves for full participation in the social and political, as well as, the economic mainstream of our society.

So far we have made spectacular progress in providing buildings, equipment and personnel in over a thousand communities. In many states our colleges enroll from fifty to seventy-five percent of first-time freshmen. But these are the easy parts of our assignment. Much more difficult is the creation of the variety of educational programs necessary for the diversified student body who fill those buildings. We have little trouble meeting the needs of students from middle and upper income families but we have only made a start in providing for students from low income families.

Our goal for 1980 must be directed toward enabling all our students to succeed either in a career program or in a transfer program. To accomplish this goal we must provide a wide variety of traditional and non-traditional programs. Our colleges must do no less for our economically disadvantaged students of the Nineteen Seventies than our elementary schools did for the children of immigrants in the early part of this century.

Bibliography

Campbell, Ronald. "Collective Bargaining: Some Reflections of a President." Community and Junior College Journal. 44: 2, December-January 1974, 25-28.

Education Commission of the States, Faculty Collective Bargaining in Postsecondary Institutions: The Impact on the Campus and on the State. May 1972.

Lombardi, John. Managing Finances in Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Macomb County Community College (Michigan). Policies and Procedures for Administrative Personnel. 1973.

McHugh, William F. and O'Sullivan, Richard. New York Community College Collective Negotiation Contact Survey, Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1971.

Murton, Curtis S., Jr. The Chief Executive's Role in Collective Bargaining. Speech delivered at American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Convention, February 26, 1974.

Nathan, Robert S. "Truth or Consequences." Change, Winter 1971-72, 20-22.

Office of Governmental Affairs, "Special" (Newsletter). American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. February 24, 1974.

Salmon, Paul B. "Are the Administrative Team and Collective Bargaining Compatible." Compact, 6: 4, June, 1972.

Sheldon, M. Stephen and Park, Young (Eds.) A Directory of Self-Instructional Materials Used in Community Colleges. (2nd Ed., revised) Los Angeles: University of California Danforth Junior College Program and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1972.

Semas, Philip W. "Public Campuses in Eight States Targets of Union Organizers." The Chronicle of Higher Education. 8: 3, September 24, 1973, 3.

Wattenbarger, James L. "Who Really has the Power?" Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 2, October 1973, 10-12.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 5 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION